



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/868,375	06/18/2001	Anton Oguzhan Alford Andrews	PHN-17.707	8890
24737 7590 06/20/2007 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			EXAMINER VU, THANH T	
			ART UNIT 2174	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/20/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/868,375	Applicant(s) ANDREWS ET AL.	
	Examiner Thanh T. Vu	Art Unit 2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 March 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 35-74 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 35-41 and 62-64 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 42-44, 47-52, 54-58, 60, 61, 65-68 and 70-74 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 45, 46, 53, 59 and 69 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on has been entered 03/21/2007.

This communication is responsive to Amendment, filed 03/21/2007.

Claims 35-74 are pending in this application. In the Amendment, claims 62-74 were added, and claims 35, 41-42, 60, and 61 were amended.

Specification

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Art Unit: 2174

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 66-68, and 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 66 recites "said touch screen directly abuts a part of the table top". There is a lack of written description in the specification for the claim limitation.

Claims 67 and 68 recite "said touch screen extends to an outer part of said table top". There is a lack of written description in the specification for the claim limitation.

Claim 70 recites "said touch screen is disposed horizontally in said table top and is flush with areas of said table top surrounding said touch screen". There is a lack of written description in the specification for the claim limitation.

Claim 72 recites "said touch screen is disposed horizontally and enclosed within an outer part of said upper table side". There is a lack of written description in the specification for the claim limitation.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2174

Claims 73 and 74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The term "substantially" in claim 73, lines 2 and 4 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "substantially" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 2174

Claims 42-44, 47, 49, 50, 60 and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nawaz et al. ("Nawaz", U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,621) and Yamada et al ("Yamada", U.S. Pat. No. 6,259,432).

Per claim 42, Nawaz teaches an information processing device for exploring information by a user, comprising:

a display screen to display a plurality of flowing links within a flow zone, each of the flowing links being linked to respective information units for display as a presentation in a presentation zone of the display screen (fig. 3; col. 8, lines 14-23 and 34-44; *the examiner interprets flowing links to be scrolling list of data items are being display in a flow zone 142 of fig. 3; each data items (or links) is linked to respective information and the user can select the link to display the respective information, see col. 3, lines 50-55; col. 9, lines 20-25*); and an input device responsive to control by the user to directly alter the flow of the links and to select one of the flowing links (*a user can alter the flow of the links by select variable speeds through a control menu, and select one of the flowing links, col. 8, lines 44-47 and col. 9, lines 20-25*).

Although, Nawaz suggests data items can be scrolled at variable speeds and scrolled in different directions horizontally or vertically (see, col. 8, lines 42-50) and the data items can be displayed in a an application window (see, col. 9, lines 55-62), Nawaz does not specifically teach the flow zone comprises a flow control means responsive to appropriate manipulation of the input device by the user within the flow zone to selectively change the flow speed and flow direction. However, Yamada teaches a flow control means (*mouse of fig. 5*) responsive to appropriate manipulation of the input device by the user within a flow zone (*scrolling of information within an application window or frame, see fig. 7*) to selectively change the flow

Art Unit: 2174

speed and flow direction (fig 6; col. 18, lines 20-47). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the flow control means as taught by Yamada in the invention of Nawaz in order to provide a control option to directly adjust speed of the scrolling data items within a display window and visually provide scrolling speed.

Per claim 43, the modified Nawaz teaches an information processing device according to claim 42, wherein the flowing links move at a default flow speed and a default flow direction within the flow zone (Nawaz, *data item are scrolled at a default speed and in a certain direction* see, col. 8, lines 42-50), and the input device is controlled by the user to selectably change the flow speed or flow direction (Yamada, col. 18, lines 20-47; *a mouse is used to selectable change a flow speed or flow direction*).

Per claim 44, the modified Nawaz teaches an information processing device according to claim 43. Yamada further teaches wherein the input device is a user operable point-and-select device for selecting a location within the flow zone (*clicking of input device for selecting a specific location* see col. 12, lines 36-44), and flow of the flowing links within the flow zone is stoppable in response to the user statically selecting a location within the flow zone with the user operable point-and-select device (*it is inherent that scrolling is stoppable when the user selecting a location by moving the mouse 200 to the initial located display (initial coordinate) because the scroll speed is relative to the initial display (initial coordinate)*, see col. 18, lines 27-31).

Per claim 47, the modified Nawaz an information processing device according to claim 43, wherein the flow zone is arranged to alternately display the links and flow control areas (Nawaz; *ticker display pane 142 of fig. 3 displays links (e,g, 150 and 152 ect.), each link*

Art Unit: 2174

represents a control area because it is select by the user (see col. 9, lines 20-25), and the flow is controlled by selecting the flow control areas with the input device (Yamada, user can select a location within a window frame and control the scrolling speed or direction, see col. 12, lines 36-44 and col. 18, lines 20-45).

Per claim 49, the modified Nawaz teaches an information processing device according to claim 42, further comprising: a filtering unit including a plurality of user selectable filters for controlling the flow zone to display links to information units which meet a requirement imposed by a selected filter (Nawaz, col. 9, lines 37-54; *customization of content provided in the viewer 142 of fig. 3*).

Per claim 50, the modified Nawaz teaches an information processing device according to claim 49, wherein the filtering unit adapts the selected filter to display links to information units similar to the related information unit (Nawaz, col. 9, lines 37-54; *a user can customize the content provided in the viewer 142 of fig. 3*).

Claims 60 and 61 individually are rejected under the same rationale as claim 42.

Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nawaz et al. ("Nawaz", U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,621), Yamada et al ("Yamada", U.S. Pat. No. 6,259,432), and Barraus et al. ("Barraus", U.S. Pat. No. 6,693,652).

Per claim 48, the modified Nawaz teaches an information processing device according to claim 42 having information related to data item or link is displayed when selected (see col. 3, lines 51-55 and col. 9, lines 20-25) but does not teach wherein the start of presentation of the

Art Unit: 2174

content from the related information unit responds to the user dragging the selected link to the presentation zone. However, Barraus teaches dragging a link to a browser window will automatically retrieve the webpage related to the link (fig. 15; steps 1508-1512; col. 25, line 56-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the teachings of Barraus in the invention of the modified Nawaz in order to provide the user with automatically displaying of a web page related to a link by dragging the link to a browser window.

Claim 51 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nawaz et al. ("Nawaz", U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,621), Yamada et al ("Yamada", U.S. Pat. No. 6,259,432) and Bates et al. ("Bates", U.S. Pat. No. 6,832,350).

Per claims 51 and 54, Nawaz teaches an information processing device according to claim 42, but does not teach a user-link unit to maintain a plurality of preferred user-links and display the user-links in a further zone. However, Bates teaches a user-link unit to maintain a plurality of preferred user-links and display the user-links in a further zone (fig. 4 and fig. 14, col. 9, lines 53-67; *user can maintain a plurality of preferred use-links and display the user links in a window by creating bookmarks*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the teachings of Bates in the invention of the Nawaz in order to provide the user with a method for creating bookmarks and organizing and presenting such bookmark.

Per claim 54, the modified Nawaz teaches an information processing device according to claim 51, wherein a frequency of display of an information unit in the flow zone is determined by its age and/or popularity (Nawaz, col. 9, lines 37-54; col. 8, lines 62-57; *since the data items*

are being displayed in rotation one after another, the users can set how often they want to see a data item by choosing more or less number of content providers to source the data items).

Claim 52 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nawaz et al. ("Nawaz", U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,621), Yamada et al ("Yamada", U.S. Pat. No. 6,259,432), and Bates et al. ("Bates", U.S. Pat. No. 6,823,350), and Glaser (U.S. pat. No. 6,392,671).

Per claim 52, the modified Nawaz teaches an information processing device according to claim 51, comprising the user-link unit for sorting and/or retrieving the preferred user-links (Bates; fig. 4 and fig. 14, col. 9, lines 53-67; *user can maintain a plurality of preferred use-links and by using bookmarks*), but does not teach further comprising: a detector for communicating with a user supplied data carrier in response to control by the user-link unit for retrieving the user personal preferences (col. 2, lines 38-45; col. 5, lines 27-33; *a mouse with memory for storing user personal preferences*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the teachings of Glaser in the invention of the modified Nawaz in order to automatically transport user preferences from one computer system to another computer system.

Claim 55 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nawaz et al. ("Nawaz", U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,621), Yamada et al ("Yamada", U.S. Pat. No. 6,259,432), and Flutka et al. ("Flutka", U.S. Pat. No. 5,758,934).

Per claim 55, the modified Nawaz teaches an information processing device according to claim 42, but does not teach a table for supporting the display screen. However Flutka teaches a

Art Unit: 2174

table for supporting the display screen (fig. 1; see Abstract; col. 2, lines 45-51). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a screen is adapted for use in a horizontal plane as taught by Flutka in the invention of Nawaz in order to improve the health of the computer operator and to provide for an unimpeded forward line of sight by the computer operator.

Claim 56 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nawaz et al. ("Nawaz", U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,621), Yamada et al ("Yamada", U.S. Pat. No. 6,259,432), and Naidoo (U.S. Pat. No. 6,629,136).

Per Claim 56, Nawaz teaches an information processing device according to claim 42, but does not teach the respective information units for display on the display screen correspond to a location of the information processing device. However, Naidoo teaches the respective information units for display on the display screen correspond to a location of the information processing device (col. 2, lines 21-41). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a screen that is adapted for use in a horizontal plane as taught by Naidoo in the invention of Nawaz in order to automatically provide information content to the user based on location of the user's device.

Claims 57, and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nawaz et al. ("Nawaz", U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,621), Yamada et al ("Yamada", U.S. Pat. No. 6,259,432), and Ku et al. ("Ku", U.S. Pat. No. 6,005,767).

Per claims 57 and 58, Nawaz teaches an information processing device according to claim 42, but does not teach wherein the display screen and the input device are embodied as part

Art Unit: 2174

of a portable device, and wherein the portable device is a hand-held device. However, Ku teaches wherein the display screen and the input device are embodied as part of a portable device, and wherein the portable device is a hand-held device (col. 2, lines 25-29, col. 4, lines 36-41; col. 5, lines 6-15; *portable computer with input device*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the teaching of Ku in the invention of Nawaz in order to provide a user with a portable computer which is lightweight and convenient to transport.

Claims 65, 67, 68, 71 and 72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nawaz et al. ("Nawaz", U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,621), Ku et al. ("Ku", U.S. Pat. No. 6,005,767), and Nevin (U.S. Pat. No. 6,553,919).

Per claim 65, Nawaz teaches a display screen comprising:

a graphical user interface having a plurality of user responsive display elements for displaying on the display screen (fig 3, *ticker display viewer with plurality display elements or links*, see col. 8, lines 14-22), the responsive display elements comprising:

a flow zone comprising a list of flowing links displayed around a periphery of the display screen (*the examiner considers the list of flowing links to be scrolling list of links*, see col. 8, lines 14-23 and lines 34-44. *This list of links are display around the top edge of the desktop 104 of fig. 3 and it can be displayed around the right edge of the desktop see fig. 10*); and

a presentation zone for presenting information selected from the flowing links as a presentation (see col. 3, lines 51-56 and col. 9, lines 20-25; *user can select a link from the*

Art Unit: 2174

scrolling links to be displayed. Such display is considered as a presentation in a presentation zone (e.g. browser display of fig. 11)).

Although Nawaz teaches a display screen for displaying said graphical user interface, Nawaz does not specifically teach the display screen is a touch screen and a table comprising a table top and display screen occupies a portion of a table top. However, Ku teaches a computer with touch-screen technology (col. 2, lines 25-29; and col. 5, lines 1-15; *a computer with a touch sensitive screen*). Nevin teaches a table comprising a table top and display screen occupies a portion of a table top (see fig. 1; *a table with display screen built-in*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the computer with a touch-screen as taught by Ku and a table with a built-in display as taught by Nevin in the invention of Nawaz in order to provide the user with a portable computer that is enhanced with a touch screen technology which allows the user directly enter data directly through the touch sensitive screen and in order to provide the user with a desk or a table with a built-in display which is mounted so that it can be moved to an appropriate viewing position relative to the work surface, when required.

Per claim 67, the modified Nawaz teaches a table according to claim 65. Nevin further teaches where said touch screen extends to an outer part of said table top (fig. 1; *the examiner considers the surface surrounding the display screen as an outer part of the table top. In fig 1, the left side or right side of the display screen 14 extends to an outer part of the table top*).

Per claim 68, the modified Nawaz teaches a table according to claim 67, said touch screen is enclosed in said table top by said outer part (fig. 5, *the display screen is enclosed is enclosed in said table top by said outer part*).

Claim 71 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 65.

Per claim 72, the modified Nawaz teaches a table according to claim 71. Nevin further teaches said touch screen is disposed horizontally and enclosed within an outer part of said upper table side (figs. 5 and 6; *the display screen is shown disposed horizontally and enclosed within an outer part of said upper table side*).

Claims 66, 70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nawaz et al. ("Nawaz", U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,621), Ku et al. ("Ku", U.S. Pat. No. 6,005,767), and Nevin (U.S. Pat. No. 6,553,919) and McNelly et al. ("McNelly", U.S. Pat. No. 6,243,130).

Per claims 66, and 70, the modified Nawaz a table according to claim 65 having a table with a built-in touch screen as described above. The modified Nawaz does not specifically teach said touch screen is directly abuts a part of said table top, and said touch screen is disposed horizontally in said table top and flush with areas of said table top surrounding said touch screen. However, McNelly teaches a display that is being built into a table wherein the screen is directly abuts a part of said table top (col. 8, lines 32-33; *a display screen is being built into a table the screen surface flush (or abut) with table surface*), and is disposed horizontally in said table top and flush with areas of said table top surrounding said touch screen (col. 8, lines 32-33; *a display screen is being built into a table the screen surface flush with table surface*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the a display screen is being built into a table the screen surface flush with table surface as taught by McNelly in the invention of the modified Nawaz in order to provide the user with a different viewing angle of a display screen in which the display screen surface is flush with the table

Art Unit: 2174

surface. This viewing angle would be advantageous in a classroom setting because this would give a better line of sight between an instructor and his or her student.

Claims 73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nawaz et al. ("Nawaz", U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,621), and Nevin (U.S. Pat. No. 6,553,919).

Per claim 73, Nawaz teaches an information processing device comprising:

a display screen to display a plurality of flowing links within a flow zone, each of the flowing links being linked to respective information units for display as a presentation in a presentation zone of the display screen (fig. 3; col. 8, lines 14-23 and 34-44; *the examiner interprets flowing links to be scrolling list of data items are being display in a flow zone 142 of fig. 3; each data items (or links) is linked to respective information and the user can select the link to display the respective information, see col. 3, lines 50-55; col. 9, lines 20-25*); and an input device responsive to control by the user to directly alter the flow of the links and to select one of the flowing links (*a user can alter the flow of the links by select variable speeds through a control menu, and select one of the flowing links, col. 8, lines 44-47 and col. 9, lines 20-25*).

Nawaz does not specifically teach a table comprising an upper and substantially horizontal table side; and a display screen is disposed horizontally in said upper table side. Nevin teaches a table comprising an upper and substantially horizontal table side and a display screen is disposed horizontally in said upper table side (figs. 5 and 6; *the display screen is shown disposed horizontally in an upper table side*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include a table with a built-in display as taught by Nevin in the invention of Nawaz in order to provide the user with a desk or a

Art Unit: 2174

table with a built-in display which is mounted so that it can be moved to an appropriate viewing position relative to the work surface, when required.

Claims 74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nawaz et al. ("Nawaz", U.S. Pat. No. 5,959,621), Nevin (U.S. Pat. No. 6,553,919) and Ku et al. ("Ku", U.S. Pat. No. 6,005,767), and Nevin (U.S. Pat. No. 6,553,919).

The modified Nawaz teaches the table according to claim 73, the display screen and the input device cooperated to form a graphical user interface, and the plurality of flowing links within the flow zone are user responsive display elements displayed around a periphery of the screen (Nawaz, *the examiner considers the list of flowing links to be scrolling list of links, see col. 8, lines 14-23 and lines 34-44. This list of links are display around the top edge of the desktop 104 of fig. 3 and it can be displayed around the right edge of the desktop see fig. 10*).

The modified Nawaz does not specifically teach the display screen is a touch screen. However, Ku teaches a computer with touch-screen technology (col. 2, lines 25-29; and col. 5, lines 1-15; *a computer with a touch sensitive screen*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the computer with a touch-screen as taught by Ku in the invention of Nawaz in order to provide the user with a portable computer that is enhanced with a touch screen technology which allows the user directly enter data directly through the touch sensitive screen.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 35-41 and 62-64 are allowed.

Art Unit: 2174

Claims 45-46, 53, 59, and 69 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: The prior art either alone or in combination doesn't teach the limitation of "a flow control means responsive to appropriate strokes made on the touch screen by the user within the flow zone to selectively change flow speed and flow direction of the flowing links" in combination with the other claimed features.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Response to Arguments

Applicants' arguments in the Amendment have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

As for claims 42, 60 and 61, applicant's primary argument is that the cited references do not teach "a flow zone comprising... a flow control means responsive to appropriate strokes made on the touch screen by the user within the flow zone to selectively change flow speed and flow direction of the flowing links". It is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., strokes made on the touch screen by the user) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Art Unit: 2174

As for claims 42, 60, and 61, the applicant points out that there is no basis to combine Nawaz and Yamada. The examiner does not agree for the following reasons:

Nawaz suggests data items can be scrolled at variable speeds and scrolled in different directions horizontally or vertically (see, col. 8, lines 42-50). In addition, the data items can be displayed in an application window (see, col. 9, lines 55-62). Yamada teaches a scrolling control means (*mouse of fig. 5*) responsive to appropriate manipulation of the input device by the user within an application window (*scrolling of information within an application window or frame, see fig. 7*) to selectively change the scrolling speed and scrolling direction (fig 6; col. 18, lines 20-47).

In this case, both Nawaz and Yamada teach scrolling of data items within an application window. However, Yamada teaches a specific method of using a mouse control means to selectively change the scrolling speed and scrolling direction of data items within an application window as described above.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the scrolling control means in an application window as taught by Yamada in the invention of Nawaz in order to provide a control option to directly adjust speed of the scrolling data items within a display of an application window and visually provide scrolling speed (see, col. 1, line 10-15).

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanh T. Vu whose telephone number is (571) 272-4073. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur and every other Fri 7:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

Art Unit: 2174

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Thanh T. Vu
Patent Examiner
AU 2174, TC 2100